







APPLICATION NO.					
All Lichthon No.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/808,843	03/15/2001	Peter Crane	169.12-0487	5267	
164 759	90 08/11/2003	4			
KINNEY & LANGE, P.A. THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING 312 SOUTH THIRD STREET			EXAMINER		
			СНЕМ, ТІАМЛЕ		
MINNEAPOLIS	S, MN 55415-1002		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2652		
		•	DATE MAILED: 08/11/2003	7	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

()



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Transmark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER TOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450



APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
				EXAMINER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER	
				6	

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

In response to the telephone interview, Applicant amended the claims to correctly describe Applicant's ionvention: to prevent the deflection of the rotor, rather than the stator. However, in specification p. 6, line 19-22, it is still found that "Beam structure 46 of the present invention prevents the stator from significantly shifting vertically out of the horizontal plane." Corresponding correction on this statement and possible others is needed.

Tianjie Chen Examiner Art Unit 2652 08/02/2003

	Application No). _	Applicant(s)					
Interview Summary	09/808,843		CRANE ET AL.					
merviou cumuny	Examiner		Art Unit					
	Tianjie Chen		2652					
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):								
(1) <u>Tianjie Chen (Examiner, PTO)</u> .	(3)							
(2) Gayle A. Bush (Representative).	(4)							
Date of Interview: <u>06/18/2003</u> .								
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2	2) <mark> applicant's</mark>	representative]					
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.							
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1,2,5,7 and 20</u> .								
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>none</u> .								
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g	ı)∏ was not rea	ached. h)⊠ N	/A.					
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>Examiner pointed out that in the embodiment in this application the deflection of rotor, rather than stator, was prevneted. Applicant agreed on Examiner's assertion and would amend the claims.</u>								
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)								
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.								
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.		xaminer's signa	ature, if required					